

and children first. Just recently, she organized a bipartisan effort to improve Michigan's high school proficiency test. In 1994, under her able leadership a special committee developed a 14 bill package on domestic violence that was signed into law helping millions of women and children deal with the pain of domestic abuse.

Sharon has not only been active in Lansing, she is deeply involved in Macomb County. Sharon had been an active member in organizations such as the Clinton Township Goodfellows, the Mount Clements Art Center, Macomb County Child Abuse and Neglect Information Council, Vietnam Veterans Chapter 154, and the Democratic women's caucus. Throughout the years, she has worked on issues that concern children, seniors, veterans, substance abuse and environmental causes. Sharon's expertise, developed from her work in counseling and social work, has given her a special talent for helping people.

Throughout the years, I have had the pleasure to work with Sharon on many issues and projects. She is a problem solver and strong leader. Few people have given to their community as Sharon has given to hers. Her vision and dedication has touched the lives of many people. I want to congratulate Sharon on her very distinguished career in the legislature. We will miss her very much in the State legislature but I am confident Sharon's vision will continue to touch our lives. I wish Sharon and her husband Dana all of the best and I look forward to working with them on many valuable projects in the future.

#### A TRIBUTE TO THE EASTERN CAMPUS OF SUFFOLK COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

**HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 30, 1997*

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Eastern Campus of Suffolk Community College as its students, professors, administrators, and friends celebrate the college's 20th anniversary of providing higher education to the communities of eastern Long Island.

Opened in 1977 on a 192-acre site in the rural Pine Barrens region of Southampton Town, near the Suffolk County seat in Riverhead, the Eastern Campus is the third and smallest campus of Suffolk County Community College system. But the dreams of those students who attend this 2-year institution of higher education are no smaller than those attending the most prestigious Ivy League school. For the past 20 years, the Eastern Campus of SCCC has provided a glorious opportunity to the diverse mix of students from the rural and suburban communities of Eastern Suffolk County to receive their college degrees and achieve their personal dreams.

The diversity of the Eastern Campus' student body is as deep as it is wide, ranking from those who have just graduated high school to a growing number of returning adults—be they displaced workers or former homemakers—who seek the advanced skills needed in today's marketplace. What they possess in common is a commitment to edu-

cation and the work ethic as the path to a better life.

The dedication is evident in the 34 percent of students who work full-time while attending the college, and the 27 percent who drive more than 21 miles to attend classes at the Southampton campus. To serve this diverse range of students, the Eastern Campus of SCCC offers a wide array of 2-year associates degrees from accounting to technology, early childhood education to restaurant management.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representative join me in honoring the Eastern Campus of Suffolk Community College on this special 20th anniversary celebration. We on eastern Long Island take special pride in our commitment and support for education, and we are privileged to have the Eastern Campus of Suffolk Community College here in our backyard, providing our family and neighbors with the opportunities they need to better themselves and make our community a better place for all of us to live and work.

#### FINISHING THE JOB OF REFORM IN LATIN AMERICA

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 30, 1997*

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention my monthly newsletter on foreign affairs from October 1997 entitled *Finishing the Job of Reform in Latin America*.

I ask that this newsletter be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

#### FINISHING THE JOB OF REFORM IN LATIN AMERICA

The President's recent trip to Latin America highlights the striking changes in relations between the United States and its neighbors in the hemisphere. There were no glaring disputes or major anti-American protests. There were many points of agreement between the President and his counterparts in the countries he visited—Venezuela, Brazil and Argentina. Reform has taken hold in Latin America, but much remains to be done to finish the job.

Democracy and free markets. Democracy and free markets—long time U.S. foreign policy goals for the region—have become the norm throughout Latin America during the past decade. These changes have had tangible benefits: U.S. exports to Latin America are growing twice as fast as those to any other region of the world.

In Venezuela, President Caldera has restored confidence in a government previously riddled by scandal. An emerging oil industry is rapidly absorbing U.S. investment and produces more oil for U.S. consumers than any other country. Through fiscal and monetary discipline, Venezuela is beginning to tame corruption and inflation.

In Brazil, military regimes are gone, replaced by an elected president and an independent Congress. The Brazilian economy is the eighth largest in the world, and by far the largest in Latin America. No longer constrained by Brazilian protectionism, \$7 billion in direct investment poured into Brazil from the United States last year alone. Brazil's 160 million consumers bought more U.S. goods last year than did China.

Argentina has also replaced military juntas with a succession of elected presidents and legislatures. Argentina's military—once a law unto itself—is now a model for international cooperation and participation in peacekeeping operations. President Clinton designated Argentina a major non-NATO ally based on its impressive peacekeeping record and responsible international role.

Incomplete reform. Reform in Latin America is not yet complete, and the progress made so far is fragile. Corruption continues to hinder investment and benefit the well-connected. Narcotics remains a dangerous and costly problem. Journalists do not have the freedom to expose official corruption, and justice systems lack credibility. Poverty and vast disparities of income still threaten economic reform and play into the hands of antidemocratic forces. These problems are widespread, and are especially evident in Colombia, where guerrillas threaten democracy, and Peru, where the greatest threat to democracy is the president.

U.S. Policy. The U.S. needs to take a clear-eyed view of both the achievements and shortcomings of reform in Latin America. Our policy toward the region should work to consolidate the substantial gains in democracy and civilian control of the military. Yet we need to do more to address narcotics, corruption, human rights abuses, and income disparities. U.S. leadership and sustained interest in the region can strengthen reformers and help move Latin America toward further reform.

First, the United States must lead on free trade and economic integration in the hemisphere. Opening Latin America's economies is the most important step we can take to help create a new middle class in Latin America and consolidate democracy. To make U.S. leadership on trade possible, Congress must grant the President fast-track negotiating authority and approve trade parity for the Caribbean economies.

Closer trade ties and market reforms will also help address the most critical internal problem in the region: low living standards and vast social economic disparity. Trade and liberalization will foster economic discipline and reduce inflation, which hurts the poor the most. They will also free up resources spent previously on inefficient state industries, providing funds to implement additional reforms in education and social programs. President Clinton should urge his fellow leaders to implement such reforms when he meets with them at the Summit of the Americas next year in Chile—having fast-track authority will boost his ability to do so.

Second, the United States must work more closely with its partners in Latin America. U.S. unilateral action—as with the Helms-Burton law on Cuba—undermines cooperation, and stands in stark contrast to the cooperative successes we have had elsewhere in the hemisphere. We need multilateral cooperation to address our common problems, including corruption, arms trafficking, environmental degradation and the flow of narcotics.

Narcotics not only lead to misery in North America, but are a leading source of corruption and a threat to democracy in Latin America. The issue can only be addressed as part of a multi-faceted U.S. policy of regional cooperation. To promote such cooperation, Congress should repeal the certification statute, which requires the President to sanction countries that don't measure up to U.S. counter-narcotics standards. That statute has outlived its usefulness.

Third, the United States should redouble efforts to strengthen the rule in Latin America. These advances depend on the political will of the region's leaders, but U.S. technical assistance programs can provide the

support necessary once leaders decide to let independent institutions operate.

Fourth, regional and international organizations should be strengthened and encouraged to support reformers and build a consensus on democratic reform. The Organization of American States can play a central role in promoting press freedom, and the U.S. should encourage the Inter-American Development Bank to support educational reform and small enterprise.

Conclusion. Latin America has come a long way in a short time, much to the benefit of the United States. The President's trip put an important focus on the region, and the challenge now is to sustain the attention of U.S. policymakers. With strong support for reform from the United States, the region can consolidate the gains we have so long sought and help create a more stable, democratic and prosperous Latin America.

#### TRIBUTE TO RONALD BROOKS WATERS

#### HON. MIKE MCINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1997

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute today to Mr. Ronald Brooks Waters of Lexington, SC, who displayed extraordinary courage and self-sacrificing assistance in the capture of two accused murderers in Cumberland County, NC.

On September 23, 1997, Cumberland County Sheriff's Deputy David Walter Hathcock and Highway Patrol Trooper Lloyd Edward Lowry were slain while attempting to apprehend two individuals who were operating a stolen vehicle. Mr. Waters was traveling north on Interstate 95 and witnessed the brutal shootings. He repeatedly put his own life in danger in order to relay valuable information to law enforcement personnel which led to the capture of these two armed and dangerous individuals. On two occasions, the suspects attempted to shoot him at point blank range. Had the weapon not jammed, Mr. Waters would surely have been wounded. Yet, through all of this, Mr. Waters displayed great courage as he continued to provide information that led to the capture of the suspects.

Mr. Waters is to be commended for his heroic actions, and I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing and honoring this outstanding citizen who went above and beyond the call of duty with his self-sacrificing assistance to the Cumberland County law enforcement personnel.

#### FAST TRACK AUTHORITY

#### HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1997

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to share with my colleagues the reasons I am unable to support H.R. 2621, the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Authorities Act of 1997.

I support the principle of granting fast track authority to President Clinton to negotiate new trade agreements. Since our markets are the most open in the world, we have the most to

gain by international agreements that pry open markets in countries with protectionist policies. In addition, we are uniquely positioned to forge relationships with our neighbors in this hemisphere that can help raise their standards of living and provide a significantly larger consumer base for our goods and services. Finally, since Mexico and Canada now enjoy special trade status with the United States under the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA], it would seem illogical to deny a similar arrangement to other countries in the region.

Unfortunately, however, the debate on trade policy no longer encompasses simple unfair dumping and tariff barriers. Trade negotiations now have a direct impact on our country's ability to maintain strong health and environmental standards because these standards can be challenged as trade barriers.

The fast track language under H.R. 2621 is more regressive than that held by previous administrations and further restricts the authority of the President to negotiate trade agreements that include domestic and global environmental objectives. In addition, the language on food safety standards could reduce levels of risk to an international lowest common denominator. Third, the language would entitle companies to collect compensation if unjustified nontariff barriers restrict their activities. Since many environmental and health regulations have been interpreted as nontariff barriers to trade, governments could be required to compensate companies when public health and welfare regulations hinder capital flows. And finally, my longstanding concern that the broad rulemaking authority of international trade bodies is not instituted in a transparent, democratic manner has not been adequately addressed.

#### DIRECTLY RELATED TO TRADE LANGUAGE WOULD THREATEN ENVIRONMENTAL SAFEGUARDS

Since the fast track procedure was established in 1974, Presidents have been granted broad discretion to negotiate and include in fast tracked bills any terms the President has judged necessary or appropriate. Unfortunately, H.R. 2621 severely constrains President Clinton's ability to negotiate environmental, health, and labor provisions in trade agreements and leaves open to challenge many of the environmental and health protections we already have in place.

Under section 102(a)(2) of H.R. 2621, labor and environmental measures are considered overall trade objectives only if they are directly related to trade and decrease market opportunities for U.S. exports or distort U.S. trade. Under this legislation, funding for border clean-up projects, worker safety objectives, infrastructure and right-to-know requirements, enforcement of multilateral environmental agreements, and human rights standards would not be part of a trade agreement.

Further, even if the President wanted to negotiate an environmental provision, section 103(b)(3)(b) would prohibit its inclusion in the fast track implementing legislation unless it were necessary for the operation or implementation of the U.S. rights or obligations under such trade agreements.

In addition, the 1988 fast track language included "reducing or eliminating barriers, taking into account domestic objectives such as legitimate health and safety \* \* \*" as a goal for trade in services and foreign investments. H.R. 2621, however, would "reduce or elimi-

nate barriers to international trade in services including regulatory and other barriers that deny national treatment and unreasonably restrict the establishment and operation of service suppliers." (Section 102.2)

H.R. 2621 simply fails to protect our Nation's ability to maintain strong environmental and health standards. Although section 102(b)(7)(B) seeks "to ensure that foreign governments do not derogate from or waive existing domestic environmental, health, safety or labor measures \* \* \* as an encouragement to gain competitive advantage," it contains no enforcement language and provides no incentives for trading partners to establish minimum levels of environmental, health, or safety protections. It also fails to address the competitive advantage that countries without environmental or labor laws would enjoy. Finally, the section contains an escape clause stating that the designation "is not intended to address changes to a country's laws that are non-discriminatory and consistent with sound macroeconomic development." Consequently, a country could waive its environmental, health and safety laws to attract investment if such an action is considered sound macroeconomic policy.

#### POTENTIAL FOR LOWEST COMMON DENOMINATOR HEALTH AND SAFETY STANDARDS

H.R. 2621 could potentially invalidate U.S. safety standards and expose Americans to levels of risk set by an international lowest common denominator. This is especially troubling given our experience with NAFTA even though U.S. Trade Representative Kantor assured Congress in 1993 that "each government may establish those levels of protection for human, animal or plant life or health that the government considers to be appropriate."

In addition, the World Trade Organization's [WTO] ruling that rejected the European Union's [EU] ban on hormone-fed beef clearly contradicts that position. Under its ruling, the WTO determined that the EU had not provided a sufficient assessment of the hormone's risk. The EU was forced to accept international standards of risk as defined by the Codex Alimentarius Commission and denied its right to make its own societal determinations of public safety even though it presented credible scientific studies in support of its position.

This case sets a dangerous precedent for other sanitary and phytosanitary judgments on food safety, biotechnology, and food irradiation decisions. It is particularly threatening to U.S. food safety since some Codex standards permit residues of pesticides that have been banned in the U.S. and allows residues of others at much higher levels than the U.S. allows. Codex standards allow higher levels of residue than the U.S. on pesticides like DDT, heptachlor, aldrin, diazinon, lindane, permethrin, and benomyl.

H.R. 2621's provisions would exacerbate this problem by restricting Congress's ability to impose precautionary bans on unsafe products. U.S. domestic legislation has often relied on such precautionary measures to protect the public health and safety. For example, certain medical devices are not allowed on the market until they can be proven safe. H.R. 2621 would shift the burden of proof to consumers and health officials to first prove that devices are not safe before they could be restricted from the market.

Of additional concern is that NAFTA's implementing legislation rewrote poultry and meat